UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/679,788	10/06/2003	Lincoln Jackson	10984-755001	3711

26161 7590 12/20/2007
FISH & RICHARDSON PC
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER
CAO, PHUONG THAO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2164	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/20/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

mv

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/679,788	Applicant(s) JACKSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Phuong-Thao Cao	Art Unit 2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 October 2007*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,7-17 and 19-28* is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5, 7-17 and 19-28* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to Amendment filed on 9/11/2007 and entered with an RCE filed on 10/17/2007.

2. Claims 1, 21-24 and 28 have been amended, and claims 6 and 18 were previously cancelled. Currently, claims 1-5, 7-17 and 19-28 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/11/2007 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 9/11/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Applicant's argument that Page et al. and Martin et al. fail to teach the newly added limitation "communicating the second search parameter from the client computer to the second search engine to cause the second search engine to perform a search based on the second search parameter", Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Although Page et al. does not explicitly disclose obtaining a search parameter for the second search engine by parsing a URL associated with the first search result from the first search engine, Page et al. obviously teaches the communication of the search parameter (e.g., search keywords) to two different search engines (i.e., the first and the second search engine) in order to perform a search based on the search parameter (see Page et al., page 9, section 5.1 and Fig. 6). It is a common knowledge in the web environment that a computer implementing a web browser which requests and displays search results is a client computer, and a computer implementing a web server including a search engine which responds to clients' requests and provides search results to clients is an server. A client computer must communicate search parameter (e.g., search terms or query) to a server (i.e., search engine) in order to get the search results.

In addition, Martin et al. teaches in paragraph [0084] that "a message server computer may request the other search engines to perform the search after the message server computer receives the keyword from client computer", which indicates that the keyword (search parameter) is communicated from the client computer to a second search engine through the message server computer. Also see [0092] for the disclosure of message delivery program (located on the client computer [0037]) communicating search parameter (keyword) to a second search engine.

Regarding Applicant's argument that there is no motivation to combine the two references Page et al. and Martin et al., Examiner disagrees. Page et al. and Martin et al. teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, searching on the Web including searching multiple search engines and displaying results comprising a plurality of URL links (see Page et al., page 9 and Fig. 6 and see Martin et al., [0028] and [0029]). This close relation between the two references highly suggests an expectation of success as combined. In particular, both Page et al. and Martin et al. teach searching and displaying search results from two different search engines. As a result, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate the teaching of one reference into another reference in order to improve a system for searching and displaying search results from two different search engines.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-2, 5, 7-9, 11-13, 16-17, 20, 22 and 25-28 (effective filing date 10/6/2003) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Page et al. ("The PageRank Citation Ranking: Bringing Order to the Web", 1998) in view of Martin et al. (Publication No US 2004/0122808 filed on 6/16/2003).

As to claim 1, Page et al. teaches:

"A method" (see Page et al., page 9, section 5.1) comprising:

"displaying content associated with a uniform resource locator (URL) on a graphical user interface (GUI) executing on a client computer " (see Page et al., [page 14, Figure 7, wherein web browser displaying web content is located on a client computer);

"receiving a first search parameter for a first search engine" (see Page et al., [page 9, section 5.1 and Figure 6] wherein the PageRank based title search engine is equivalent to Applicant's "first search engine");

"displaying a first search result in a first pane of the GUI, the first search result comprising a plurality of URL links to a plurality of Web pages associated with the first search parameter and being generated using the first search engine" (see Page et al., [page 9, section 5.1 and Figure 6]);

"the second search engine being different from the first search engine" (see Page et al., [page 9, section 5.1 and Figure 6] for two different search engines, PageRank search engine and AltaVista search engine);

"communicating the second search parameter from the client computer to the second search engine to cause the second search engine to perform a search based on the second search parameter" (see Page et al., [page 9, section 5.1] for querying a second search engine in a Web environment including client computer (web browser) and server computer (web server including a search engine)); and

"displaying a second search result in a second pane of the GUI, the second search result comprising a plurality of URL links to a plurality of Web page associated with the second search parameter and being generated using the second search engine" (see Page et al., [page 9, section 5.1 and Figure 6]).

However, Page et al. does not teach "parsing a URL associated with the first search result from the first search engine to extract a second search parameter for a second search engine."

On the other hand, Martin et al. teaches "parsing a URL associated with the first search result from the first search engine to extract a second search parameter for a second search engine" (see Martin et al., [0053] for parsing URL of the web page containing the search result to extract keywords and see [0084] for using keywords for searching at another search engine).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Martin et al.'s teaching to Page et al. system by adding the feature of parsing a URL associated with the first search result from the first search engine to extract a second search parameter for a second search engine. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by Martin et al. ([0029], [0075] and [0084]), to provide an effective way to automatically search other search engines using the search parameters submitted to the first search engine. In addition, Page et al. and Martin et al. teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, searching multiple search engines and displaying results comprising a plurality of URL links (see Page et al., page 9 and Fig. 6 and see Martin et al., [0028] and [0029]). This close relation between the two references highly suggests an expectation of success as combined.

As to claim 21, Page et al. teaches:

"One or more machine readable media for storing instructions that are executable" (see Page et al., page 9, section 5.1) the instructions for causing one or more processing devices to:

"display content associated with a uniform resource locator (URL) on a graphical user interface (GUI) executing on a client computer" (see Page et al., [page 14, Figure 7, wherein web browser displaying web content is located on a client computer);

"receive a first search parameter for a first search engine" (see Page et al., [page 9, section 5.1 and Figure 6] wherein the PageRank based title search engine is equivalent to Applicant's "first search engine");

"display a first search result in a first pane of the GUI, the first search result comprising a plurality of URL links to a plurality of Web pages associated with the first search parameter and generated using the first search engine" (see Page et al., [page 9, section 5.1 and Figure 6]);

"the second search engine being different from the first search engine" (see Page et al., [page 9, section 5.1 and Figure 6] for two different search engines, PageRank search engine and AltaVista search engine; also see Martin et al., [0084]);

"communicating the second search parameter from the client computer to the second search engine to cause the second search engine to perform a search based on the second search parameter" (see Page et al., [page 9, section 5.1] for querying a second search engine in a Web environment including client computer (web browser) and server computer (web server including a search engine)); and

"display a second search result in a second pane of the GUI, the second search result comprising a plurality of URL links to a plurality of Web page associated with the second search parameter and being generated using the second search engine" (see Page et al., [page 9, section 5.1 and Figure 6]).

However, Page et al. does not teach "parsing a URL associated with the first search result from the first search engine to extract a second search parameter for a second search engine."

On the other hand, Martin et al. teaches "parsing a URL associated with the first search result from the first search engine to extract a second search parameter for a second search engine" (see Martin et al., [0053] for parsing URL of the web page containing the search result to extract keywords and see [0084] for using keywords for searching at another search engine).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Martin et al.'s teaching to Page et al. system by adding the feature of parsing a URL associated with the first search result from the first search engine to extract a second search parameter for a second search engine. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by Martin et al. ([0029], [0075] and [0084]), to provide an effective way to automatically search other search engines using the search parameters submitted to the first search engine. In addition, Page et al. and Martin et al. teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, searching multiple search engines and displaying results comprising a plurality of URL links (see Page et al., page 9 and Fig. 6 and see Martin et al., [0028] and [0029]). This close relation between the two references highly suggests an expectation of success as combined.

As to claims 2 and 22, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for the rejected claims 1 and 21 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Page et al. and Martin et al. teach:

"automatically updating the second pane in response to a change in the first pane" (see Page et al., [page 9, Figure 6] when another search term is entered, the first and second panes display a different set of result list which reads on Applicant's claim language).

As to claim 5, this claim is rejected based on argument given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Page et al. and Martin et al. teach:

"permitting viewing of a new web page in the first pane by clicking on links in both the first and the second panes" (see Page et al., [page 9, section 5.1]).

As to claim 7, this claim is rejected based on argument given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Page et al. and Martin et al. teach:

"allowing entering of a search in the second pane and displaying results of the search in the first pane" (see Page et al., [page 9, Figure 6] wherein a search is entered in the top pane and results are displayed in the two bottom panes).

As to claim 8, this claim is rejected based on argument given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Page et al. and Martin et al. teach:

"displaying a default page when no search results are generated" (see Page et al., [page 9, Figure 6] any page displayed after a search can be considered as default page).

As to claim 9, this claim is rejected based on argument given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Page et al. and Martin et al. teach:

"comparing a URL to a watch list that includes one or more URLs" (see Page et al., [page 6, last paragraph] wherein databases of URLs is equivalent to Applicant's "watch list").

As to claim 11, this claim is rejected based on argument given above for rejected claim 9 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Page et al. and Martin et al. teach:

"periodically updating the watch list" (see Page et al., [page 6, last paragraph] wherein database of URLs is equivalent to Applicant's "watch list").

As to claim 12, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Page et al. and Martin et al. teach "disabling the second pane based on a rule" (see Page et al., [page 9, Figure 6] and [page 14, Figure 7]).

As to claim 13, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 12 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Page et al. and Martin et al. teach:

"wherein the rule comprises disabling the second pane if no search results are generated" (see Page et al., [page 14, section 7.3]).

As to claim 16, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Page et al. and Martin et al. teach:

"receiving a personal reference from an external source" (see Page et al., [page 9, Figure 6])

As to claim 17, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 16 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Page et al. and Martin et al. teach:

"wherein the personal preference includes a language preference, opening preference, size of the second pane, or display search results" (see Page et al., [page 9, Figure 6] for displaying of search results as sets of 10 results).

As to claim 20 this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Page et al. and Martin et al. teach:

"automatically opening a second pane in an active mode" (see Page et al., [page 9, Figure 6]).

As to claim 25, this claim is rejected based on argument given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Page et al. and Martin et al. teach:

"displaying the first search result comprises displaying a plurality of addresses associated with the first search result" (see Page et al., [page 9, Figure 6] for URL addresses), and

"displaying the second search result comprises displaying a plurality of addresses associated with the second search results (see Page et al., [page 9, Figure 6]).

As to claim 26, this claim is rejected based on argument given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Page et al. and Martin et al. teach:

"wherein the first search result comprises a plurality of URL links associated with the first search parameter" (see Page et al., [page 9, Figure 6]).

As to claim 27, this claim is rejected based on argument given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Page et al. and Martin et al. teach:

"wherein the second search result comprises a plurality of URL links associated with the second search parameter" (see Page et al., [page 9, Figure 6]).

As to claim 28, Page et al. teach:

"An apparatus" (see Page et al., page 9, section 5.1) comprising:

"a computer system including a processor and memory" (see Page et al., page 9, section 5.1 for web environment including client and server computers); and

"a computer readable medium storing a program product comprising instructions that when executed cause the computer system to" (see Page et al., page 9, section 5.1):

"display content associated with a uniform resource locator (URL) on a graphical user interface (GUI) executing on a client computer" (see Page et al., page 14, Figure 7, wherein web browser displaying web content is located on a client computer);

"receive a first search parameter for a first search engine" (see Page et al., [page 9, section 5.1 and Figure 6] wherein the PageRank based title search engine is equivalent to Applicant's "first search engine");

"display a first search result in a first pane of the GUI, the first search result being associated with the first search parameter and being generated using the first search engine" (see Page et al., [page 9, section 5.1 and Figure 6]);

"the second search engine being different from the first search engine" (see Page et al., [page 9, section 5.1 and Figure 6] for two different search engines, PageRank search engine and AltaVista search engine);

"communicate the second search parameter from the client computer to the second search engine to cause the second search engine to perform a search based on the second search parameter" (see Page et al., [page 9, section 5.1] for querying a second search engine in a Web environment including client computer (web browser) and server computer (web server including a search engine)); and

"display a second search result in a second pane of the GUI, the second search result being associated with the second search parameter and being generated using the second search engine" (see Page et al., [page 9, section 5.1 and Figure 6]).

However, Page et al. does not teach "parsing a URL associated with the first search result from the first search engine to extract a second search parameter for a second search engine."

On the other hand, Martin et al. teaches "parsing a URL associated with the first search result from the first search engine to extract a second search parameter for a second search engine" (see Martin et al., [0053] for parsing URL of the web page containing the search result. to extract keywords and see [0084] for using keywords for searching at another search engine).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Martin et al.'s teaching to Page et al. system by adding the feature of parsing a URL associated with the first search result from the first search engine to extract a second search parameter for a second search engine. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by Martin et al. ([0029], [0075] and [0084]), to provide an effective way to automatically search other search engines using the search parameters submitted to the first search engine. In addition, Page et al. and Martin et al. teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, searching multiple search engines and displaying results comprising a plurality of URL links (see Page et al., page 9 and Fig. 6 and see Martin et al., [0028] and [0029]). This close relation between the two references highly suggests an expectation of success as combined.

8. Claims 10, 14-15, 19 and 24 (effective filing date 10/6/2003) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Page et al. ("The PageRank Citation Ranking: Bringing Order to the Web", 1998) in view of Martin et al. (Publication No US 2004/0122808 filed on 6/16/2003), and further in view of Kyne et al. (US Patent 6,615,237 filed on 2/4/2000).

As to claim 10, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 9 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Page et al. and Martin et al. do not teach "automatically opening a second pane in response to a user navigation to a URL included in the watch list".

Kyne et al. teaches "automatically opening a second pane in response to a user navigation to a URL included in the watch list" (see [column 8, lines 55-67] and [column 9, lines 1-10] wherein search provider list is equivalent to Applicant's "watch list" and choosing the option

"Display results, and go to the most likely site" could automatically open the second pane to display search results when the user uses a search provider (accessed by a URL) to perform the search).

It would be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Kyne et al.'s teaching to Page et al. system by adding the feature of automatically opening a second pane in response to a user navigation to a URL included in the watch list. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so to provide an effective way to control the look of the user interface of the browser. . In addition, Page et al. and Kyne et al. teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, searching data in a network (e.g., Internet) and displaying results comprising a plurality of URL links. This close relation between the two references highly suggests an expectation of success as combined.

As to claim 14, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 12 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Page et al. and Martin et al. do not teach "the rule comprises disabling the second pane in response to external input."

Kyne et al. teaches "the rule comprises disabling the second pane in response to external input" (see Kyne et al., [column 8, lines 65-67] wherein only main window displayed).

It would be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Kyne et al.'s teaching to Page et al. system by adding the feature of disabling the second pane in response to external input. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so to provide an effective way to control the look of the user interface of the browser. In addition, Page et al. and Kyne et al. teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, searching data in a network (e.g., Internet) and displaying results comprising a plurality of URL links. This close relation between the two references highly suggests an expectation of success as combined.

As to claim 15, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 14 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Page et al., Martin et al. and Kyne et al. teach:

"wherein the external input comprises an input received via a button or hyperlink" (see Page et al., [page 9, Figure 6] for button and hyperlink).

As to claim 19, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Page et al. and Martin et al. do not teach "opening a second pane in response to a input in a passive mode".

Kyne et al. teaches "opening a second pane in response to an input in a passive mode" (see Kyne et al., [column 8, lines 55-67] and [column 9, lines 1-10] wherein the user selection of "Display results, and go to the most likely site" open the second pane as illustrated in Applicant's claim language).

It would be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Kyne et al.'s teaching to Page et al. system by adding the feature of opening a second pane in response to an input in a passive mode. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so to provide an effective way to control the look of the user interface of the browser. In addition, Page et al. and Kyne et al. teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, searching data in a network (e.g., Internet) and displaying results comprising a plurality of URL links. This close relation between the two references highly suggests an expectation of success as combined.

As to claim 24, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 21 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Page et al. and Martin et al. do not teach "a watch list having a URL and open a second pane in response to a user navigation to a URL included in the watch list".

Kyne et al. teach "a watch list having a URL and open a second pane in response to a user navigation to a URL included in the watch list" (see Kyne et al., [column 8, lines 55-67] and [column 9, lines 1-10] wherein search provider list is equivalent to Applicant's "watch list" and choosing the option "Display results, and go to the most likely site" could automatically open the second pane to display search results when the user uses a search provider (accessed by a URL) to perform the search).

It would be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Kyne et al.'s teaching to Page et al. system by adding the feature of including a watch list having a URL and opening a second pane in response to a user navigation to a URL included in the watch list. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so to provide an effective way to control the look of the user interface of the browser. In addition, Page et al. and Kyne et al. teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, searching data in a network (e.g., Internet) and displaying results comprising a plurality of URL links. This close relation between the two references highly suggests an expectation of success as combined.

9. Claims 3-4 and 23 (effective filing date 10/6/2003) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Page et al. ("The PageRank Citation Ranking: Bringing Order to the Web", 1998) in view of Martin et al. (Publication No US 2004/0122808 filed on 6/16/2003), and further in view of Minard (US Patent 6,247,020 issued on 6/12/2001).

As to claims 3 and 23, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 1 and 21 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Page et al. and Martin et al. do not teach "automatically updating the second pane in response to a user navigation in the first pane".

Minard teaches "automatically updating the second pane in response to a user navigation in the first pane" (see Minard, [column 9, lines 3-7]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Minard's teaching to Page et al. system by adding the feature of automatically updating the second pane in response to a user navigation in the first pane. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so to provide an effective way view and recognize information from the same source displayed in both panes. In addition, Page et al. and Minard teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, using browser to display and navigate data. This close relation between the two references highly suggests an expectation of success as combined.

As to claim 4, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 3 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Page et al. and Martin et al. do not teach "wherein updating the second pane includes differentiating links viewed in the first pane in the second pane".

Minard teaches "wherein updating the second pane includes differentiating links viewed in the first pane in the second pane" (see Minard, [column 9, lines 3-10] wherein node is equivalent to Applicant's "link").

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Minard's teaching to Page et al. system by adding the feature of wherein updating the second pane includes differentiating links viewed in the first pane in the second pane. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so to provide an effective way view and recognize information from the same source displayed in both panes; as a result, a user can compare and use effectively the two sets of search results displayed in two panes. In addition, Page et al. and Minard teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, using browser to display and navigate data. This close relation between the two references highly suggests an expectation of success as combined.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Phuong-Thao Cao
Art Unit 2164
December 11, 2007

C. Rones
CHARLES RONES
SUPERVISORY PATE NER